UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/733,850 | 12/12/2003 | John Charles Calhoon | 003797.00691 | 9029 |

28319 7590 12/16/2005

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET , N.W.
Suite 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| BERHANU, SAMUEL | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2838 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/733,850 | CALHOON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Samuel Berhanu | 2838 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 September 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *26 and 27* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Terminal Disclaimer*

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 9/15/2005 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of application numbers 10/733820 and 10/733760 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 25 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 24. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-11, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens (US 5,734,254) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143).

Regarding Claim 1, Stephens discloses in Figures 1 and 2 an apparatus (40) for transmitting inductive energy to a power adapter (10) in proximity thereof the power adapter assembly including a microprocessor (20) for processing data relevant to the

inductive energy, the apparatus comprising: a memory (50) for storing computer readable instructions relevant to providing inductive energy to a power adapter; and for storing identification data corresponding to at least one power adapter the identification data being received from a remote computer through a network; and

a processor unit (50) operatively coupled to the memory; and a transmission element (62) operatively coupled to the processor unit so as to provide the Inductive energy to the power adapter based on the identification data; and a housing (10) for enclosing the memory and processor unit therein (Column 1, lines 53-55). Stephens does not explicitly disclose a memory for storing identification data corresponding to at least one power adapter the identification data being received from a remote computer through a network; and a processor unit providing the inductive energy to the battery adapter based on the identification data. However, Stobbe discloses in Figures 2 and 3, a security device having wireless energy transmission, a memory (62) for storing identification data corresponding to at least one power adapter the identification data being received from a remote computer through a network (the wireless communication means can be considered as a wireless network); and a processor unit (26) providing the inductive energy to the battery adapter based on the identification data (Noted that the receiving and the transmitting devices exchange identification data via a wireless communication means, when data is verified electrical action such as charging or providing energy executes). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer

means in Stephens battery pack and adapter system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted energy transfer.

Regarding Claim 2, Stephens discloses the claimed invention, except the apparatus in which the memory includes authentication data for authenticating the power adapter for the inductive energy transmission. However Stobbe discloses the apparatus in which the memory includes authentication data for authenticating the power adapter for the inductive energy transmission (Column 6, lines 5-20). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Stephens battery pack and adapter system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

Regarding Claim 3, Stephens discloses a communications device for receiving and transmitting data (20,50) and the communications device being operatively coupled to the transmission element (24,54)

Regarding Claim 4, Stephens discloses an antenna and a communications device configured to receive (24,54) the computer readable instructions and configured to transmit (24,54) the instructions to the antenna for wireless data communications to a power adapter (Column 3, lines 41-49).

Regarding Claim 5, Stephens discloses a processor unit (50) is configured to receive a plurality of power parameters from the power adapter. (Column 3, lines 59-67, column 4, lines 1-6).

Regarding Claim 6, Stobbe discloses a processor unit (18) is Configured to receive a digital security certificate from a power adapter (Column 6, lines 5-20).

Regarding Claim 7, Stephens discloses a plurality of transmission elements (24,32,38) responsive to receiving a power adapter.

Regarding Claim 8, Stephens discloses an apparatus configured for receiving inductive energy (32), comprising: a memory for storing computer readable data (18) relevant to receiving the inductive energy; a processor unit (50) for processing the computer readable data and for processing data communications with a computer system; a coil configured for receiving inductive energy (32) based on identification data transmitted from a remote computer through a network, the identification data corresponding to the apparatus; a power supply (30) operatively coupled to the processor unit (20) and the coil (30); the power supply configured to output a direct current (30) responsive to the inductive energy ; and a housing (10) for enclosing the memory and processor unit therein (Column 1, lines 53-55). Stephens does not explicitly disclose a coil configured for receiving inductive energy based on identification data transmitted from a remote computer through a network, the identification data corresponding to the apparatus; However, Stobbe discloses in Figures 2 and 3, a coil (58) configured for receiving inductive energy based on identification data transmitted from a remote computer (12) through a network, the identification data corresponding to the apparatus (Noted that the receiving and the transmitting devices exchange identification data via a wireless communication means, when data is verified electrical action such as charging or providing energy executes).

Regarding Claim 9, Stephens discloses the claimed invention, except the processor unit is configured to provide authentication data for inductive energy reception. However, Stobbe discloses except the processor unit is configured to provide authentication data for inductive energy reception (Column 6, lines 5-20). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Stephens battery pack and adapter system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

Regarding Claim 10, Stephens discloses the apparatus, comprising a communications device (20) operatively coupled to the pickup coil (32).

Regarding Claim 11, Stephens discloses the apparatus, in which the communications device (20) is configured to receive the computer readable data and transmit the data to the pick up coil (32).

Regarding Claim 13, Stobbe discloses the processor unit is configured to provide a digital security certificate to a power source (Column 6, lines 5-20).

Regarding Claim 15, Stobbe discloses the an antenna (52) and a communications device (22,24) configured to receive the computer readable data and configured to transmit the data to the antenna for wireless data communications a charging source (Column 5, lines 35-45).

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens (US 5,734,254) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143) as applied to Claim 8 above, and further in view of Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012).

Regarding Claim 12, neither Stephens nor Stobbe disclose the processor unit is configured to provide a plurality of power parameters to a power source, which provides the inductive energy. However, Garcia et al. disclose except the processor unit is configured to provide a plurality of power parameters to a power source which provides the inductive energy. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Stephen's battery pack and adapter system in order to transmit battery parameters as taught by Garcia et al. so that the device can make any necessary charging adjustments.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens (US 5,734,254) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143) as applied to Claim 8 above, and further in view of Higuchi et al. (US 6,163,132).

Regarding Claim 14, neither Stephens nor Stobbe disclose the processor unit is configured to send data to the computer system so as to indicate it is receiving inductive energy. However, Higuchi discloses in Figure1 the processor unit (4b) is configured to send data to the computer system (5) so as to indicate it is receiving inductive energy (Column 4, lines 33-38). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a computing and indicating system in Stephens battery pack apparatus as taught by Higuchi et al. in order to monitor battery status.

7. Claims 16, 17, 19, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143)

Regarding Claims16 and 22, Garcia et al disclose in Figures 2 and 3 a computer implemented method of providing inductive energy to a power adapter, comprising the step of: wirelessly receiving a polling message from a source (Column 2, lines 47-59); based on identification data corresponding to the power adapter transmitted from a remote computer to the source through a network;); transmitting a request for power to the source (204); and receiving inductive power from the source based on the identification data. (Column 2, lines 30-59). Garcia et al. do not disclose an identification data corresponding to the power adapter transmitted from a remote computer to the source through a network and receiving inductive power from the source based on the identification data. However, Stobbe discloses in Figures 2 and 3 an identification data corresponding to the power adapter transmitted from a remote computer to the source through a network and receiving inductive power from the source based on the identification data. (Noted that the receiving and the transmitting devices exchange identification data via a wireless communication means, when data is verified electrical action such as charging or providing energy executes). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Stephens battery pack and adapter system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted energy transfer between the power adapter and the source.

Regarding Claims 17 and 23, Garcia et al. disclose the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting power parameters to the source (column 2, lines47-59).

Regarding Claim 19, a step of initiating a charger responsive to the step of receiving (Column 2, lines 30-59).

8. Claims 18, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143).

Regarding Claims 18, 24 and 25, Garcia et al. disclose the claimed limitation, except the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting authenticating data to the source. However, Stobbe discloses the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting authenticating data to the source. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Garcia et al. wireless battery charging system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

9. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143) as applied to Claim 16 above, and further in view of Parks et al. (US 5,455,466).

Regarding Claim 19, neither Garcia et al. nor Stobbe disclose a step of converting the inductive power to a direct current responsive to the step of receiving. However, Parks et al. disclose in Figure 1 a step of initiating a step of converting the inductive power to a direct current responsive to the step of receiving (Column 2, lines 35-50). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a charging rectifier circuit in Garcia et al wireless battery charging

system as taught by Parks et al. in order to supply direct current appropriate for charging the battery pack.

10. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143) as applied to Claim 16 above, and further in view of Higuchi et al. (US 6,163,132).

Regarding Claim 20, neither Garcia et al. nor Stobbe disclose a step of transmitting data to a computer system for indicating the step of receiving inductive power. However, Higuchi et al disclose in Figures 1 and 2 a step of transmitting data to a computer system for indicating the step of receiving inductive power (Column 4, lines 33-38). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a computing and indicating system to the battery pack in Garcia et al. as taught by Higuchi et al. in order to monitor battery status.

Regarding Claim 21, Higuchi et al disclose in Figure 3 a step of displaying an object on a graphical user interface (6) indicative of the step of receiving (Column 4, lines 60-63).

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 9/15/2005 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, or not persuasive.

12. Regarding applicants Claim 7 arguments, Claim 7 does not have the alleged elements argued such as " the transmission elements being coupled to the processor unit and providing inductive energy to a power adapter" Thus, the argument is irrelevant or not material.

***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

SB

KARL D. EASTHOM
PRIMARY EXAMINER